

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated August 25, 2005. Claims 1, 3 to 11, 19 to 22, 24, 25, 27 to 30, 32 to 34, 36 to 40 and 48 to 59 are pending in the application, with Claims 2, 23, 26 and 35 having been cancelled and Claims 57 to 59 having been added. Claims 1, 3 to 5, 8, 19, 25, 27, 28, 32 to 34, 36 to 38 and 48 have been amended, and Claims 1, 19, 25, 32, 33 and 48 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 11, 19 to 30, 32 to 40 and 48 to 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,800 (Barrera) in view of Using Netscape, 1995 Que Corporation, pp. 56-57, 73-82 (Ernst). Claims 2, 23, 26 and 35 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter and without conceding the correctness of their rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns presenting search results obtained from a search conducted over a computer network (or formatting an electronic document intended for reproduction by printing). According to one feature of the invention, a portion of extracted data including searching criteria is formatted into a printable document, to present (or reproduce) the portion in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of the extracted data.

For example, Figures 3, 5 and 6 depict a representative embodiment in which a print preview form is used for presenting the portion in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of extracted data. Of course, it should be noted that the scope

of the claims is not limited to this representative embodiment and/or the details shown in Figures 3, 5 and 6.

By virtue of the foregoing feature, in which the portion is presented (or reproduced) in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of extracted data, the need for a user to review and/or print the entire content of a search result URL location is reduced.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a method of presenting search results obtained from a search conducted over a computer network, the search being performed using searching criteria and returning information including a network location corresponding to each search result. The method includes the steps of interpreting one of the search results including the corresponding network location, and extracting data associated with the corresponding network location. The method also includes the steps of examining the extracted data to identify therein the searching criteria to provide at least one specific location within the extracted data of the searching criteria, and using the one specific location to identify a portion of the extracted data including at least the searching criteria. In addition, the method includes the step of formatting the portion including the searching criteria into a printable document, to present the portion in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of the extracted data. The above steps are repeated for each remaining search result in which the formatting step incorporates the corresponding formatted portion into the printable document.

Independent Claims 25 and 33 are respectively directed to an apparatus and a computer readable medium which are seen to generally correspond to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 19 as amended is directed to a method of formatting an electronic document intended for reproduction by printing. The method includes the step of obtaining, from a searching process, location information within a computer network of at least one search result returned by the searching process. The method also includes the step of using the location information to fetch and store document data from the computer network relating to each search result, the document data including at least a portion incorporating the searching criteria used to instigate the searching process. In addition, the method includes the step of formatting the document data including at least the portion into a printable electronic document to thereby reproduce the portion in the printable electronic document in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of the extracted data.

Independent Claims 32 and 48 are respectively directed to an apparatus and a computer readable medium which are seen to generally correspond to Claim 19.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, Barrera and Ernst are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that a portion of extracted data including searching criteria is formatted into a printable document, to present (or reproduce) the portion in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of the extracted data.

As understood by Applicants, Barrera discloses Web searching using categories to narrow a search, and more particularly discloses narrowing the web sites searched based on a category associated with the web sites, and then performing a keyword search on the content of the identified web sites. See Barrera, column 2, lines 55 to 65.

The Office Action, at page 3, took the position that Figure 4 of Barrera discloses that a search engine's query results include either the search term itself (i.e., AT&T), or an allegedly close match (i.e. AT+T).

However, while Figure 4 of Barrera may be seen to have a close or similar match for the term "AT&T", the corresponding description at column 2, lines 21 to 43 is silent as to requiring that search terms be displayed or formatted along with retrieved information. In fact, Figures 8 to 10 suggest away from such display or formatting of retrieved information, since the search term "telephone" is not seen to be displayed or formatted together with retrieved query results.

Nevertheless, even if Barrera discloses that search terms are displayed or formatted along with retrieved information (a point which Applicants do not concede), the cited portions of Barrera are still not seen to disclose or suggest that a portion of extracted data including searching criteria is formatted into a printable document. Moreover, Barrera is not seen to disclose or suggest that the portion is presented (or reproduced) in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of the extracted data. Furthermore, Barrera is not seen to provide the attendant benefits provided by such formatting of the portion, such as reducing the need for a user to review and/or print the entire content within a search result URL.

In addition, Ernst has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Barrera. In particular, although page 57 of Ernst may be seen to disclose a print preview window, the window of Barrera is not seen to be used for presenting (or reproducing) a portion of extracted data, the portion including searching criteria.

As such, even if Barrera and Ernst are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be permissible), the result would not teach at least the feature that a portion of extracted data including searching criteria is formatted into a printable document, to present (or reproduce) the portion in the same manner as if presented within the entirety of the extracted data.


Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 19, 25, 32, 33 and 48 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Magliyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 106581v1